The Brethren Evangelist
PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT
The Brethren Publishing House,
ASHLAND, OHIO.

Terms of Subscription.

One Copy one year,	$1.50
One Copy six month,	.75
One Copy four months,	.50

Send Money by Express, Postal Money Order, Draft, or Registered Letter, payable to the order of A. L. Garber. One and 2-cent stamps will be accepted for sums under one dollar only; we much prefer Postal Notes to stamps, but both are at the risk of the sender.

Please examine the date printed with your name on the paper and if the proper credit is not made send us notice.

The paper will be continued to regular subscribers until we are notified to stop it, unless such directions accompany the order.

ADDRESS,
THE BRETHREN PUB. HOUSE,
ASHLAND, Ashland Co., OHIO.

H. R. HOLSINGER, Corresponding Editor.

ASHLAND, O., APR. 28, 1886.

Semi Editorial.

Have just read the EVANGELIST of April 21, and that too, just fresh from the press, and before any of our subscribers read it. Don't know, however that that has much to do with that of which I want to write. Our Savior said: "Of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," and I know that I am chuck full of a good thing just now, and yet I am not sure that I can verify that other nice saying of Jesus, that: "A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good;" but I will try.

The first thing that touched me off, was sister Annie Arnold's letter headed, "Church Work." Her article will commend *itself* to all appreciative readers; I only want to thank her for it, and then proceed. Now what moved me is this: What would the EVANGELIST become, and what could the Brethren church do, if *all* our young sisters, who might be classed with sister Arnold, would earnestly respond to her closing paragraph, which I quote with emphasis:

My dear young friends don't read this with indifference, but resolve at once that by the help of Him who has created and gives you all you enjoy that you will do all in your power, by word and action, for the furtherance of His cause, in the manner dictated by His will through your conscience.

The sisters will excuse me if I should become a little personal. I can't help it, because I don't want to. I want to do something, and I see very well there is no other way of doing it than by taking hold of the thing you want to accomplish. Now I have traveled much among our people, as most all the readers of the EVANGELIST know, and am personally acquainted with a greater percentage of our members, than perhaps any other one man among us. I know Annie Arnold; I know she is an earnest, sincere, faithful Christian sister. I know we have other young sisters in various parts of the country, who have written, and who I know can write well, and who have the success of the good cause at heart, and upon these I want to call, to join sister Arnold in Christian work. And for fear that nobody will know who I mean I will name a list of such as I can call to mind in the "spur of the moment." There is Mary Sterling, Maggie Miller, Emma Stouffer, 'Manda Musselman, Rose Arthur, Lottie Holsinger, Sadie Trent, Laura Grossnickel, Kate Yost,—there I have nine, and if I had time to think I could name twelve, besides many others coming on, who would catch the inspiration from good example, for a small torch will light many candles. Then there are many married sisters, with ability and experience, who—it would seem—might find time to write at least occasionally. There is sister Sarah Keim, for instance; she has only one man to take care of. She could find pretty near spare time enough to edit a paper herself, when she has no visitors. Then there is Carrie Holsinger; how long it is since she has been heard from. God bless her; I know her heart is heavy for a dark cloud came over her during the last year. But then there is a bright spot on the other side. Lift up your head and believe, and hope, and see! Emma Sigerfoos, who used to regale the EVANGELIST readers regularly, now would let us starve.

Laura Miller Snider, of blessed old C. F. C. memory, is one of our best writers, but the readers of our paper now hardly know her.

Come sisters, young and old—no, good sisters never get old—but named or unamed, let us have a revival. Let us just make the paper boom with lively, cheerful, inspiring correspondence and essays. Let us see who can get up the newest, and most helpful articles. Give a little time each day to the Christ and his church. Your help is needed in the paper, in the Sunday School and in the prayer meeting. Please lend it to the God. He will return and reward liberally.

Sister Lizzie Beeghly, of the Bear Creek church, Ohio, has my sincere thanks for the respectable club of one dollar donations by the sisters of that church, and secured through her solicitations. That shows what can be done by energy and application. It also shows in what way young sisters may make themselves useful in the work of the church. Twenty-seven dollars in a church, all of the sisters, in one dollar donations, is the best that has yet been done in that way. Will not others follow the good example of sister Beeghly?

Happy to notice that brother Summers is not to be left freeze.

The Dayton lawsuit for the old meeting house, was quite an affair. The surroundings made one think of annual meeting. There was Robert Miller, Jos. Kauffman, Olive Yont, George Holler, John Smith, and a number of others who were in the "order," with a whole row of bonnet sisters, as witnesses and spectators. Hearing the witnesses occupied from Tuesday morning until Friday forenoon.

The Old Order brethren put the case into court by sending up a petition asking the court to order the house to be sold and the money divided equally between the three factions of the Dunkard church. To this petition the Brethren made reply. To our reply the German Baptists filed a reply.

Then when the Old Orders saw that they were getting themselves into a lawsuit, and remembered that they were opposed to going to law, they declined to prosecute the case; but the German Baptists stepped into their place and became the plaintiffs. And right here I want to tell the Old Order brethren what I have against them. They did go to law in this case, and they must not deny it, or they will bring a greater sin upon themselves: telling a falsehood. I have given the facts in the case, just as they will be found in the records of the Montgomery county court. I am very sorry that they did it, but they did. It was a rash and inconsiderate act. We were always willing to grant them the use of the house for worship, for which purpose it was originally donated and dedicated, and we would always have done so. They wanted it sold, and had their petition been granted, the spot upon which our old brethren stood and preached Christ, and the lot donated to the worship of God by those whose bones have long ago crumbled back to dust, might soon have been occupied by a saloon or a gambling hall! If the Brethren gain the suit, they and the German Baptists, shall still share such privileges with us, if we lose, the Old Order will lose all their interests, and we will lose all our interests, and the Old Order will be to blame, as they commenced the case. We have always given them credit for being honest, but if they try to evade the truth they will be as bad as the Conservatives.

Before I resume the court report, I want to state some facts. Before the general church division, in the spring of 1882, the members of the Beaver Creek church, residing within the limits of the incorporation of Dayton, sent a petition to the council of the Beaver Creek church to which they belonged, asking privilege to form themselves into a separate and distinct organization. That petition was granted unanimously, at a regular quarterly council meeting of said Beaver Creek church, certificate of which facts was laid before the court, signed by the elder and other officers. Shortly after the members of the city met in the old church now in dispute, and organized themselves into a church, and went to work in good earnest.

The G. B.'s claim that the petition was not "legally" granted, and the organization not "legally" effected, because the adjoining elders were not present. To show up this point was their great effort. Their first witness was R. H. Miller. By him they wanted to prove the elder power and the mandatory nature of the annual meeting decisions, even from time immemorial. It will not be necessary to follow his testimony, and I do not think our readers care for it. Kauffman affirmed to what Miller had stated, and in addition he stated what he knew about the Dayton organization, and declared it to be illegal, according to the usages of the Miami Valley. And to this they all testified.

The point the Brethren tried to establish was that when the Beaver Creek church granted the petition of the Dayton members, that church released its jurisdiction over them; and that they recognized this fact and the new organization, when they ceased to pay them the "annual visit," a very well established "usage" of the Miami Valley, and as nearly a "general usage" as there is any in the church. We also proved that the Dayton organization was effected in accordance with general usage, having one ordained elder present, to preside over them, with two second degree ministers as assistants, and the unanimous consent of all the members interested and that the church has had regular uninterrupted services in the church, with Sabbath School and prayer meetings for a considerable time. We claim that the property came into our possession just as it did into that of the Beaver Creek church, by division of territory.

I was placed upon the stand and kept there for several hours. I was run over the history of the church from the time of Alexander Mack down to the Arnold's Grove usurpation. The evidence sought for from me was to show that the Dunkard church was congregational; that it had no regular, well established rules or practices except such as are clearly taught in the Gospel; that the annual meeting decisions were received as advice only, in all matters not well defined in the gospel, up to the period of usurpation and division when such decisions were made mandatory; and that any business transacted by the unanimous consent of a church, in the presence of an ordained elder, if such business was in harmony with the Gospel, must be legal.

In the cross examination I was run through the entire book of minutes, with the hope of spoiling my evidence regarding the binding power of the decisions of annual meeting and the authority of the elders. They are welcome to all they made of me.

As there was another case on the docket for the day, the argument was deferred to some future time.

LATER:—The argument in the Dayton church property case has been deferred to Tuesday, May 4.

HOLSINGER.

"Mother's Bread of Life."

A sister far in the East writes to us that her mother is dead who was a constant reader of the EVANGELIST, and that she found so much comfort in reading it, that her children were accustomed to call it "Mothers bread of life." It is a satisfaction to hear that good and faithful mothers appreciate the fruits of our labors performed amidst many annoyances and the storms, strivings, and revolutions in human affairs, and religious organizations.

We covet the lot of the mother who has born the heat and the burden of a long and useful life, and in her declining years is able to apply her mind in feeding upon things that pertain to godliness and eternal life. That mother had a treasure in heaven, and the Bible she read is perfect but the paper in which she found consolation, was not, in some respects, but as a wise master-builder, she was able to divide that which was good for her purposes in the Christian life from that which was not, and was pleased.

That mother, no doubt, did feed upon the real bread of life, and had abiding in her eternal life; and when the Master shall come to gather the faithful ones from the earth, and lift those who are sleeping from their saintly repose, she will be among the glorified throng. Happy thought!

Neither Law Nor Gospel.

During the church property trial at Dayton, Ohio, between the German Baptist and the Brethren churches, one of the latter's witnesses had testified that they had disciplined a member for having signed a license petition. As they claim to have nothing but the gospel for their rule of church government, the cross examining attorney wanted to know in what part of the gospel authority was found for such proceedings. He was answered, that the Bible said: "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that puttest thy bottle to him and makest him drunken:" that the gospel says, "no drunkard shall inherit the Kingdom of heaven," and so it cannot be right to authorize men to sell liquor and make men drunk.

"But," said the lawyer, "did not the Savior associate with publicans and sinners?"

"Yes, sir."

"Well, were not those publicans saloon keepers?"

Answer, in a suppressed tone: "I thought they were tax collectors."

It is to be hoped that lawyer is better versed in law than he is in the gospel.

"Church Union."

Brother Jake Replogle says some nice things in his article under the caption of "Behold the Lamb of God," and addressed himself personally to us, although we have left that part out.

We certainly believe that if self could be laid aside that a different state of affairs would exist in the Church and among Christian people. We are glad to know that we were born without any prejudices, whatever, in favor of any one's church, and we were open heart and soul to accept church union and labor for its accomplishment. We listened with satisfaction, years ago, to nice speeches made by representatives of different denominations in favor of "Church Union," and wished that it might be so. After awhile somebody wanted us to preach, and as a part of our duty we tried to preach—and to preach the gospel. The gospel says he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. We preached that and believed that it was good doctrine. We met another preacher and he was in favor of church union; but he said baptism was not a saving ordinance and it was not necessary to be baptized, and he proved to be one of the most bitter partisans we ever met.

We were invited to preach in other churches and we did so. We preached without price, and preached that there ought to be more harmony of action among Christian people. We were complimented over our efforts, and wished God speed in our work. We held forth the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the people, and talked about the power of an endless life and obedience to the commands of Christ. This was good enough, but after a time sinners were awakened to their condition and showed penitent feelings and were prompted to join church. There was then a change in ap-